



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/090,650

03/04/2002

Barry Bond

MS1-779US

6104

22801

7590

06/15/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/090,650

Applicant(s)

BOND ET AL

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/14/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-16 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-16 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to communication filed 03/14/06.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "one or more modules the medium" in claim 8.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In the present case, the claimed invention does not fulfill any of the disclosed utilities as in specification, and not practical application as no beneficial final result for loading one or more executable images into a memory.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodrov (US 6802006) in view of Wu et al. (US 6959339) (Wu).

Regarding claim 1, Bodrov discloses: A computer-readable medium having computer-executable modules comprising:

a file locator configured to locate an executable image on a computer media (col. 4, lines 34-42, Bodrov);

a memory-mapper configured to open the executable image from the computer media and read it into a computer memory (col. 208, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Bodrov);

an importer configured to find a list of executable image names to load (col. 4, lines 61 to col. 5, lines 5, Bodrov);

a binder configured to link multiple executable images together, such images being those of the list of executable image names ((col. 4, lines 15-28, Bodrov);

an exporter configured to build a representation of program modules that an executable image exports (col. 5, lines 15-18, Bodrov);

a file-format recognizer configured to recognize the file format of the executable image from amongst a database file format definition(col. 4, lines 43-60, Bodrov). Bodrov discloses: the database 108 have executable image 100 and executable image 200 as fig. 2. However Bodrov is silent to discloses: a database of multiple file format definitions. On the other hand, Wu discloses: discloses: a database of multiple file formats as col. 10, lines 40-48. Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a database of multiple file formats in the system of Bodrov as taught by Wu. The motivation being to the operating system provide a digital library for storing multiple image file formats, the digital content can be recognized as authentic with these signatures, watermarks, a form of electronic signature currently in use throughout digital library solution.

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein the importer is further configured to direct the loading of multiple executable images of the list of executable image names to load (col. 4, lines 15-28, Bodrov).

Regarding claim 4, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein the file-format recognizer is further configured to select one or more of a group of available pluggable sub-loaders is capable of loading the recognized file format of the executable image (col. 3, lines 58-67, Bodrov).

As per claims 5, 6 and 7, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: A computer-readable medium having computer-executable modules comprising: a searcher configured to search a computer media for an executable image for loading (col. 7, lines 12-50, Bodrov);

a format recognizer configured to the format of the executable image (col. 4, lines 43-60, Bodrov);

a memory-mapper configured to load and map the executable image into memory based upon the format of the executable image (col. 208, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Bodrov);

a sub-loader configured to examine a data structure of the executable image to determine whether to load additional images (204 and corresponding text and col. 3m, lines 58-67, Bodrov);

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein one or more modules the medium are configured to be replaced with a replacement module without recompilation of one or more modules (col. 4, lines 32-39, Wu).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein the memory-mapper is further configured to convert the executable image before mapping it into the memory (col. 6, lines 1-9, Bodrov).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein the memory-mapper is further configured to decrypt the executable image before mapping it into the memory (col. 4, lines 15-28, Bodrov).

As per claims 13, 14 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 8. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claims 16, 19 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Bodrov/ Wu discloses: a method, a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions that when executed by a computer for facilitating loading to one or more executable images a varying formats, the method comprising: locating an executable image on a computer media (col. 4, lines 34-42, Bodrov);

investigating information related to the executable image, thereby identifying the format of the executable image (col. 4, lines 37-55, Bodrov), wherein during the investigating an extensible database of executable-image formats is accessed (204, fig. 2 and corresponding text, col. 4, lines 15-28, Bodrov).

based upon the identified format of the image, initiating a loader associated with the identified format (208 fig. 2 and col. 7, lines 1-11, Bodrov); with that loader, loading the executable image into a computer memory (col. 10, lines 30-51, Bodrov).

Regarding claim 18, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 16 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein headers of the image contains the information related to the executable image for the investigating (col. 300, fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 44-52, Bodrov).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: a computer-readable medium having modularized computer-executable modularized sets of instructions and an operating system comprising a medium that, when executed by the computer, load one or more executable images into a computer memory, such an image having one or more formats defined by an extensible database of executable image formats (208 and 108, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Bodrov),

Regarding claim 22, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21 above. In addition, Bodrov/ Wu discloses: wherein the modularized sets of instructions are isolated with clean interfaces (col. 6, lines 26-33, Wu).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gaffin Jeffrey can be reached on 571-272-4160. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Cindy Nguyen

June 6, 2006


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER